

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	McAtee Irrigation Structure Repair
Proposed Implementation Date:	3/30/2009
Proponent:	Eugene & Lois Walsh
Location:	T8S R1W Sect. 36
County:	Madison
Trust:	Common Schools

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The purpose of the Land Use License would be for replacing/repairing a rock weir that directs water into the principal irrigation ditch for the Walsh Ranch. The weir was been in place since 1902 and was partially washed out when the Hebgen Dam structure failed in Sept. 2008.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

Madison County Conservation District – State of Montana Natural Streambed and Land Preservation Act (310 Law)

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

310 Permit, Madison County Conservation District (approved)

The 310 Permit with the following considerations:

- a. effects of soil erosion and sedimentation
- b. risk of flooding or erosion problems upstream or down
- c. effects of stream channel alteration
- d. effect on streamflow, turbidity, or water quality caused by material used or by removal of ground cover
- e. effects on fish and aquatic habitat
- f. are there reasonable alternatives to reduce disturbance to stream or better accomplish the purpose of the project .

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Proposed Alternative: Grant the Land Use License to allow for the replacement of the rock weir.

No Action Alternative: Do not grant the License.

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- *RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.*
- *Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.*
- *Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.*

4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

The site is within the Madison River. Short-term turbidity may occur in the vicinity while the work is being completed, however no long-term/permanent impact is expected due to the limited scope of the project.

5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:

Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

The work will take place within the river; the channel will not be altered, no long term change in water flow and/or water quality would be expected, and it is not foreseen that there will be any permanent change to erosion, sedimentation, or turbidity (temporary turbidity may be localized due to the moving of rocks in the river).

6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

No effect.

7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.

None expected, all work will take place in the stream and irrigation ditch channel.

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

No impact expected.

9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:

Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

No direct or cumulative impact to Threatened, Endangered or unique wildlife is anticipated as a result of the proposal due to its limited scope.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

There are no known historical or archaeological sites in the area of construction.

11. AESTHETICS:

Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

A rock weir will be noticeable extending into the river. No change from the current state.

12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:

Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

None

13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:

List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

None

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

- *RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.*
- *Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.*
- *Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.*

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

None

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

None

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

The proposal would have no affect on quantity and distribution of employment.

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

This proposal would cause no change the taxes.

18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:

Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

None.

19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:

List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

The tract is currently not zoned.

20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:

Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

No change to recreational access.

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing.

None

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

There are no native, unique or traditional lifestyles or communities in the vicinity that would be impacted by the proposal.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

None

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:

Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

This would generate \$150.00 in revenue form a Land Use License.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Katie Svoboda /s/	Date: 4/7/2009
	Title: Bozeman Unit Office Manager	

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Action Alternative: Grant the Land Use License to allow for the replacement of the rock weir.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

This license allows the repair of an existing Structure. The scope of work conducted will be in accordance with a 310 permit issued by the Madison County Conservation District. No long term impacts to water quality or wild life would be expected.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

☐ EIS ☐ More Detailed EA ☒ No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Craig Campbell
	Title: Bozeman Unit Manager
Signature: Craig Campbell /s/	Date: 4/07/2009